

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 12-20042

ZAFAR MEHMOOD, et al.

Defendants.

ORDER REGARDING JOINT REPRESENTATION PURSUANT TO RULE 44(c)

Two attorneys of the same law firm, Clark Hill, PLC, represent two Defendants in this case. Martin E. Crandall represents Zafar Mehmood and Lisa B. Kirsch-Satawa represents Falusic Ashford. Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 44(c) provides as follows in cases of joint representation:

(2) The court must promptly inquire about the propriety of joint representation and must personally advise each defendant of the right to the effective assistance of counsel, including separate representation. Unless there is good cause to believe that no conflict of interest is likely to arise, the court must take appropriate measures to protect each defendant's right to counsel.

Joint representation in any criminal case presents the potential for a conflict of interest. Accordingly, the court questioned attorneys Crandall and Kirsch-Satawa about the potential conflict and advised Defendants Mehmood and Ashford of their right to effective assistance of counsel. Mehmood and Ashford each submitted a knowing, intelligent, and voluntary, waiver of conflict. Based upon both the discussion with Defendants and their attorneys and the Defendants' submitted waivers, the court finds

that "there is good cause to believe that no conflict of interest is likely to arise." Fed. R. Crim. P. 44(c)(2). Representation may properly continue.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Robert H. Cleland

ROBERT H. CLELAND

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: December 13, 2013

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was mailed to counsel of record on this date, December 13, 2013, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

s/Lisa Wagner

Case Manager and Deputy Clerk

(313) 234-5522